

June 16, 1966

12856

agree to the amendment of the House and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) to authorize printing of additional copies of hearings, which was, in lines 3 and 4, strike out "two thousand five hundred," and insert "one thousand."

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

AAU-NCAA JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, when word was received that Jim Ryun and the other athletes would be permitted to participate in the national AAU outdoor track and field championships in New York, which is the qualifying meet for our competition with the Soviet Union in Los Angeles next month, I was, of course, along with many other people, very much satisfied.

For more than a year now, I have worked as a member of the Commerce Committee seeking a settlement to the dispute between the AAU and the U.S. Track and Field Federation. An arbitration board had been established by a Senate resolution and I was most disturbed to find that petty, arbitrary jurisdictional disputes between athletic governing bodies could jeopardize and penalize students, the institutions they attend, and our national prestige in international sports events. So it is good that Jim Ryun will be permitted to run, but I am concerned that this dispute took place.

This has been cleared up for the moment, but it is my hope that the dispute will not occur again, that a reasonable and a fair agreement can be reached between the governing bodies of the AAU and the NCAA.

However, if this cannot be, then, Mr. President, I shall seek legislation at some future date, in the Commerce Committee or otherwise, to bring this dispute to an end.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT YESHIVA UNIVERSITY BY SENATOR MANSFIELD OF MONTANA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this morning the majority leader of this body [Mr. MANSFIELD] delivered the com-

mencement address at Yeshiva University at New York City, N.Y.

The text of this address relates to the situation that now exists in southeast Asia. I am not sure that everybody will be happy with the expressions of our majority leader, because they are so factual and challenging, as is his usual manner, but I think they should be more widely read than they might otherwise be, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the address of Senator MANSFIELD, given this morning, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM AND CHINA: THE SHADOW OF WAR—THE SUBSTANCE OF PEACE

I welcome the opportunity to share this day with the Class of 1966. For the most part, you are among the last to have been born during World War II. Hence, you are among the first to have received the pledge of peace of the United Nations in 1945. The preamble to the Charter, you will recall, contains this solemn statement of purpose: "To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

The pledge has stood for twenty-one years. Commencement addresses this year might well ponder the adequacy of its fulfillment. It is a fitting theme for graduating classes, not only in the United States, but in the Soviet Union, China, Britain, and elsewhere.

The Class of 1966 has been witness, since birth, not to a growing peace in the world, but to a procession of crises and conflicts. This class has come to maturity in an atmosphere which for two decades has been heavy with war and the threat of war. This class graduates directly into the face of the bitter war in Viet Nam.

Yet the words remain: "To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

The detonation of the first atomic bomb gave to these words a great fervor in 1945. The pledge is even more compelling two decades later. Today, nuclear weapons, thousands of times more powerful, are stocked in the arsenals not only of the United States, but of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France and, perhaps now, China.

At this moment in time, peace is more than an ideal and a hope. It is a universal and urgent human necessity.

The problem of peace is the great preoccupation of the President and of the Senate. It is a problem, unfortunately, which grows more, not less, difficult with each passing day. Indeed, with respect to Viet Nam, we have yet, after extraordinary efforts, to begin to devise a formula for the resolution of the conflict.

During the past year, the effort has been made to end the war by waging more war and it has not succeeded. For a time, the effort was made to end the war by waging less war and that, too, did not succeed. The President has pursued negotiations in public. He has searched for them in private. He has sought a conference on peace on every highway and by-way of international diplomacy.

But peace remains elusive. The end of the war in Viet Nam is not in sight. The question of Viet Nam continues to command our most persevering thought. It continues to demand a most honest, restrained and thorough public discussion.

We own an unrelenting search for a peaceful solution in Viet Nam to the young Americans who have gone and who will go to that tortured land. We owe it to the Vietnamese people who have suffered from the war in great multitudes and beyond imagining. We owe it to our individual consciences and to the collective conscience of the nation.

Therefore, I address your attention, today, to the problem of peace in Viet Nam. I ask you to consider this problem in the context of the limbo in which, for more than a decade and a half, have reposed the relations between China and the United States. The two questions—peace in Viet Nam and peace with China—are very closely interrelated, if not, indeed, inseparable.

In a direct military sense, it is true that China is not presently involved in Viet Nam. We have, in fact, bent every effort to assure the Chinese that we mean them no harm and that we have no desire to share this conflict in Viet Nam with them. We have, in short, sought to avoid military engagement with China and, except in accident, so far have avoided it.

Nevertheless, China is involved in Viet Nam. Chinese participation is largely indirect, but it is nevertheless a real participation. It takes the form of encouragement of Hanoi and the National Liberation Front in the south. It includes the supply of war materials which are used against Americans and other supporting assistance.

There is also already an element of direct Chinese participation in Viet Nam. Large Chinese labor battalions are at work along the overland routes which come into North Viet Nam from China. Americans have been shot at and shot down by China, as the war in the air over North Viet Nam has skirted the Chinese borders. That is the sort of involvement which already prevails. There is every probability, moreover, that the longer the war goes on, the greater will become the extent of Chinese participation. As time goes on, an escalating war tends to take on its own relentlessness. One-by-one the hatches of avoidance shut down for all concerned.

If the Chinese are linked ever more tightly to the continuance of the war in Viet Nam, it seems to me that they are also tied inextricably to the question of peace in that nation and in Asia as a whole. I shall consider those matters, however, later in my remarks. Let me turn, first, to the inner problems of Viet Nam.

Events of the past few weeks lend to the war an air of bewildering ambiguity. It is not surprising that they engender a great deal of confusion and uncertainty in this nation.

We are engaged in war against the North Vietnamese, the Viet Cong, and the National Liberation Front of the south. But the elements of leadership in South Viet Nam who have the greatest stake in that effort are engaged in a quasi-war amongst themselves. This inner conflict has produced pressures for instability in the south which have little to do with the war in which we are engaged. In the light of these pressures, it is unrealistic to describe the situation in South Viet Nam in a clear-cut ideological context. It has never been, in fact, that kind of simple situation.

To view the conflict as wholly one of an aggression of the north against the south also does not do adequate justice to the perplexing realities of Viet Nam. The war is more than a clash between two nations or hostile strangers. It is also a rending of long associated cultures, north, central and south, which contain relatives, friends and enemies for whom the 17th parallel is a division of dubious significance and durability.

It is illustrative, in this connection, to note that the leader of North Viet Nam, Ho Chi Minh, was born much farther south in Viet Nam than the present leader of South Viet Nam, General Nguyen Cao Ky. Ho Chi Minh, the communist, was educated extensively in what is now anti-communist South Viet Nam, while Nguyen Cao Ky, the anti-communist, received his training in what is now communist North Viet Nam. And if that leaves you confused, think for a moment

June 16, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12855

"Commissioned officers"

"Pay grade"	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10 ¹	\$1,424.10	\$1,474.50	\$1,474.50	\$1,474.50	\$1,474.50	\$1,530.60	\$1,530.60	\$1,648.20	\$1,648.20	\$1,766.10	\$1,766.10	\$1,883.70	\$1,883.70	\$2,001.60	\$2,001.60
O-9	1,262.10	1,295.10	1,323.30	1,323.30	1,323.30	1,356.60	1,356.60	1,412.70	1,412.70	1,530.60	1,530.60	1,648.20	1,648.20	1,766.10	1,766.10
O-8	1,143.30	1,177.60	1,205.40	1,205.40	1,205.40	1,295.10	1,295.10	1,356.60	1,356.60	1,412.70	1,412.70	1,474.50	1,474.50	1,592.40	1,592.40
O-7	949.80	1,014.90	1,014.90	1,014.90	1,059.90	1,059.90	1,121.40	1,121.40	1,177.50	1,177.50	1,238.80	1,238.80	1,295.10	1,384.80	1,384.80
O-6	703.80	772.70	824.10	824.10	824.10	824.10	824.10	824.10	852.30	852.30	880.20	930.60	930.60	992.40	992.40
O-5	562.80	661.60	706.50	706.50	706.50	706.50	728.70	767.70	818.70	880.20	930.60	968.50	992.40	1,216.50	1,216.50
O-4	474.90	577.80	616.80	616.80	627.90	656.10	700.50	739.80	773.70	807.30	829.80	829.80	829.80	829.80	829.80
O-3 ¹	441.60	493.20	526.80	583.20	611.10	633.30	667.20	700.50	717.00	717.00	717.00	717.00	717.00	717.00	717.00
O-2 ¹	353.70	420.30	504.60	521.40	532.50	532.50	532.50	532.50	532.50	532.50	532.50	532.50	532.50	532.50	532.50
O-1 ¹	303.90	336.30	420.30	420.30	420.30	420.30	420.30	420.30	420.30	420.30	420.30	420.30	420.30	420.30	420.30

¹ While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is \$2,008.00 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title.

² Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member.

"Commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member"

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205											
	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-3-----	\$583.20	\$611.10	\$633.30	\$667.20	\$700.50	\$728.70	\$728.70	\$728.70	\$728.70	\$728.70	\$728.70	\$728.70
O-2-----	521.40	532.50	549.30	577.80	600.00	616.80	616.80	616.80	616.80	616.80	616.80	616.80
O-1-----	420.30	448.50	465.30	482.10	498.90	521.40	521.40	521.40	521.40	521.40	521.40	521.40

"Warrant officers"

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	\$449.40	\$482.10	\$482.10	\$493.20	\$515.70	\$538.20	\$560.40	\$600.00	\$627.90	\$650.40	\$667.20	\$689.40	\$712.20	\$767.70	\$767.70
W-3	408.60	443.10	443.10	448.50	454.20	457.50	457.50	532.50	549.30	565.80	583.20	605.70	627.90	650.40	650.40
W-2	357.60	387.00	387.00	398.10	420.30	443.10	459.90	476.40	493.20	510.30	526.80	543.60	565.80	565.80	565.80
W-1	298.20	342.00	342.00	370.20	387.00	403.80	420.30	437.40	454.20	471.00	487.50	504.60	504.60	504.60	504.60

"Enlisted members"

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9															
E-8															
E-7															
E-6	\$269.40	\$322.80	\$334.80	\$346.50	\$358.20	\$369.60	\$381.30	\$393.60	\$411.00	\$422.70	\$434.40	\$446.10	\$457.80	\$469.50	\$481.20
E-5	232.20	281.70	293.40	305.40	317.40	328.80	340.50	352.20	363.90	375.60	387.30	399.00	410.70	422.40	434.10
E-4	200.40	246.90	258.60	270.00	281.70	293.40	305.40	317.40	328.80	340.50	352.20	363.90	375.60	387.30	399.00
E-3	168.60	211.60	222.90	240.60	252.60	264.60	276.60	288.60	300.60	312.60	324.60	336.60	348.60	360.60	372.60
E-2	121.80	170.10	182.10	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80
E-1	100.50	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00
E-1 (under 4 months)	96.90	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00
	90.60														

SEC. 302. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member or former member of a uniformed service who initially becomes entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on the effective date of this title shall be entitled to have that pay computed using the rates of basic pay prescribed by the first section of this title.

SEC. 303. The provisions of this title become effective on July 1, 1966.

TITLE IV—WEAPONS SYSTEMS

SEC. 401. Section 125(c) of title 10, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding the following:

"However, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, the Secretary of Defense shall not direct or approve a plan to initiate or effect a substantial reduction or elimination of a major weapons system until the Secretary of Defense has reported all the pertinent details of the proposed action to the Congress of the United States while the Congress is in session. The Congress shall within ninety days thereafter advise the Secretary of Defense through the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate

and House of Representatives, respectively, of the recommendations of these Committees on the proposed action."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me emphasize that this is a military authorization bill, not an appropriation bill. It is one for military hardware, ships, and related matters.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendments, ask for a conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the Senate conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL

of Georgia, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM FOR FISCAL 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966, which was, in line 3, strike out "fourteen", and insert "four".

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate dis-

June 16, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12857

what it must do to the Vietnamese people who must live with the confusion.

What I am suggesting by this digression is that while Viet Nam may be two Houses in conflict, it is at the same time one House not only divided, but also united in many ways. What I am suggesting, too, is that events of the past few weeks represent the surfacing of but a few of the complex difficulties of the Vietnamese situation.

It seems to me that these difficulties have grown more intractable and the solutions more difficult since the tragic assassination of President Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963. Coup has followed coup until the count has been lost. In the process, the leadership of South Viet Nam has been sundered and weakened, the rivalries have grown, the mutual antipathies have increased. And, in the process, the Vietnamese people have suffered greatly in consequence of these developments as well as from the war.

In all frankness, so, too, has this nation suffered from these developments. The instability amongst the South Vietnamese leaders has meant a steady increase in our involvement in Viet Nam, and especially our military role. There is no question that the Armed Services of the United States have provided a growing margin of power without which a Republic of Viet Nam could not have survived. To them has fallen the task of filling the defensive gap left by the growing strains on the South Vietnamese authorities. On them has fallen the principal burden of meeting the increased military pressures from the north. These tasks which have been assigned to them by the nation's policies have been discharged with great dedication and at great personal sacrifice.

The increase in the American effort in Viet Nam has been and will continue to be very costly. During the past year and a half, our ground forces commitment has grown from about 25,000 to 267,000. By years' end, this figure will be much higher. The deployment of American naval and air power has been of a very great magnitude. It has brought to bear on Viet Nam the impact of tens of thousands of additional highly trained men who have unleashed a level of destructive power which may approach or even surpass that which was set loose during the Korean war.

At the beginning of 1965, the United States forces were incurring casualties at the rate of about 8 per week. Now, upwards of 500 Americans are killed and wounded each week. For the past five or six weeks in succession, the casualty rate for Americans has surpassed that of the South Vietnamese armed forces.

In monetary terms, the current cost of Viet Nam to the United States has been estimated at an annual rate in the neighborhood of \$13 billion and is continuing to rise. In early 1965, the costs were perhaps \$1 or \$2 billion.

I wish that I could tell you that this powerful injection of American resources had brought the war nearer to a conclusion. But I can only repeat what I said at the outset of my remarks, the end of the war in Viet Nam is not in sight.

It has been suggested of late—perhaps inferred is more accurate—that the war can be ended quickly by a further expansion of the American military effort and, particularly, by more and better-placed bombing. That is an appealing suggestion, and I have no doubt that it will be heard more frequently between now and November. It wraps up, in one simple thought, a criticism of the present political leadership, a promise of a less painful war, an expectation of victory at a relatively small increase in cost. In short, it suggests that there is an easy exit. Let us underscore one point, here, today: There are easy ways to plunge more deeply into this situation; there are no easy ways out of this situation.

I have just illustrated the extraordinary expansion of the American military effort—including bombing—in the past year and a half. Before going further along that path, it would seem to me that we have a great responsibility to pause and, first, consider carefully the point to which this path has led. I can assure you that the politically responsible leadership of the nation in the person of the President is not unmindful of this responsibility. There is, indeed, a most profound concern as to where this course has led and where it may yet lead.

When the sharp increase in the American military effort began in early 1965, it was estimated that only about 400 North Vietnamese soldiers were among the enemy forces in the south which totalled 140,000 at that time. Today, the overall size of the enemy in the south has increased to 250,000 of whom at least 30,000—a very conservative estimate—are considered to be North Vietnamese regulars. One source suggests that if local Viet Cong battalions which operate within their own provinces are excluded from the total, the northerners make up approximately one-half of the disciplined professional enemy soldiers in South Viet Nam and may well constitute two-thirds by year's end.

Shortly after the outset of the expansion of the military effort, it was believed that about 1,500 North Vietnamese were crossing the border each month. Just a few months ago, the maximum potential infiltration was thought to be about 4,500 per month. But infiltration has recently been reported in the press to be at a current rate well in excess of this figure.

The field of battle was confined largely to South Viet Nam when the expansion of our military effort began. Air and sea bombardment has now extended the arena of conflict throughout almost all of North Viet Nam. The war has spread sharply into Laos. More and more, it verges on Cambodia and threatens to spill over into Thailand. And as I have already mentioned, American planes have been shot at and shot down on or across the borders of China.

Whatever constructive achievement has resulted from this expansion, the fact must also be faced that the search for peace by intensification of war has begotten, not peace, but a further intensification of war. The expansion of the arena of conflict has yielded, not peace, but further expansion of the arena of conflict.

Is the war, then, to continue to intensify? Is Viet Nam—north and south—to be reduced to a charnel house amidst smoking, silent ruins? Indeed, is that to be the fate of great areas of Southeast Asia and regions beyond?

Experience requires us to recognize that this danger exists in the conflict. Prudence compels us to recognize, moreover, that the terminal point may not be reached until and unless the war has involved China directly. That possibility, it seems to me, should be faced sooner rather than later. We should examine it, now, while there is yet time to examine it in good sense and soberness. We should examine it, now, rather than wait until the actuality is confronted in the heat of some accident, miscalculation or misunderstanding or at the end of that long drift which ends in inescapable military convergence.

Certainly, the experience of Korea counsels us to examine this question without delay and, in so doing, to lay aside the distorting prism of wishful thinking. It will be recalled that a war between Koreans—north and south—a decade and a half ago, became in the end what few expected at the beginning. It became, substantially, a war between the United States and China. And you will recall, too, that in the end peace was not restored to Korea by victory but by

a truce which required the agreement of the United States and China.

The question must be asked here as well as in Peking. It must be asked now. Can peace be restored in Southeast Asia, as it was not in Northeast Asia, before, rather than after, a military clash? Can there be a turning off from the course of collision and onto the road of settlement before, rather than after, the crash?

I can give you no assurances on these questions. The answers depend not only on our wisdom and restraint but also on that of the Chinese. I can only stress to you that the relentless search for affirmative answers is a most solemn responsibility which rests especially upon the leadership of this nation and of China but concerns also the United Nations, the Geneva powers, and the entire world.

There is little doubt that this search is hampered by the long hiatus in United States relations with China. It is a decade and a half since the Chinese revolution and the Korean conflict which followed it. In all these years, little of consequence was done to close the deep void which these shattering events blasted between the peoples of the two nations. On the contrary, the seeds of hostility and suspicion were scattered widely and in both countries. The weeds of a mutual distrust were encouraged to grow high in both countries. The direct human contact between the world's most populous nation and the world's most powerful was reduced to formal and routine meetings in Warsaw between an American and a Chinese Ambassador which, over the years, have averaged out to about one a month.

In the last few weeks members of the Administration have sought to make clear in public statements that this nation seeks to restore some "bridges" to China. That is a helpful initiative. It is also useful to lower our rigid self-imposed travel and other barriers which the Executive Branch is now doing.

These acts accord with the nation's interest and they are most certainly meaningful gestures in the direction of peace. That the Chinese greet these efforts with unabated hostility does not change their validity. In the present state of Chinese-United States relations, all acts are suspect. All doubts are magnified. All fears are exaggerated. These acts, nevertheless, remain proper and modest acts which may one day redound to the benefit of both nations. That is all they are and they ought not to be regarded as anything more.

They do not, certainly, go to the core of the current danger which lies in Viet Nam and Southeast Asia. Indeed, the relevance of these acts must necessarily remain dubious, at least until that danger is faced and begins to abate.

What is needed most, at this time and in the light of that danger, is an initiative for a direct contact between the Peking government and our own government on the problem of peace in Viet Nam and Southeast Asia. This problem is of such transcendent importance, it seems to me, that it is a fit question for face-to-face discussion between China and the United States at the highest practicable level. Our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, confronted the Chinese Foreign Minister, Chen Yi, across the Conference table at Geneva in 1961-62. It may be that a similar meeting now would be useful in this critical situation.

The meeting could be confined to the two nations, or it could include all the belligerents in Viet Nam. It could include the nations of the Southeast Asian mainland since they all lie in the swath of the war's spreading devastation. It seems to me that there are many possible and acceptable alternatives insofar as participation and arrangement are concerned.

The membership and mechanics of the conferences are not key issues. History will not be gentle with those who pursue the shadow and evade the substance of peace. It will not view with sympathy those who stand too much on ceremony or who insist too much on face as the price of coming to grips with its profound problems.

An Asian conference, at this time, cannot draw a distinction between victor and vanquished in this conflict, any more than it was possible to do so in the Korean settlement. All win by peace; all lose by the war's continuance.

What a conference at this time must be concerned with is, in the first instance, a curb on the expansion of the war and a prompt and durable termination of the tragic bloodletting in Viet Nam.

It must be concerned with insuring a choice free of coercion of any kind to the people of South Viet Nam over their future and on the question of the reunification of Viet Nam.

It must be concerned with how the independence and the territorial integrity, not only of Viet Nam, but of other small nations of Southeast Asia can be safeguarded in peace.

It must be concerned, finally, with how foreign bases and foreign military forces can be promptly withdrawn and excluded from Viet Nam and other parts of the Southeast Asian mainland.

These are fundamental questions. Answers to these questions must begin to be found. And, in the last analysis, they must be concurred in by China and the United States. Those are the essentials if the conflict in Viet Nam is to end and if a reasonable and stable peace is to be established in Southeast Asia.

Let me make clear that I am not sanguine as to the possibilities that these questions will be faced in conference in the near future. Even less is it to be expected that answers to these questions are going to be found very quickly. The chasms are deep. The walls are high.

Nevertheless, at some point, these questions will have to be faced and answers will have to be found. It seems to me that we must continue to try to take those first faltering steps toward peace in Asia. We must try to take them, now, before the tragedy, which is Viet Nam, is compounded many times over. That is the great responsibility. It rests on the Chinese. It rests on this nation. It rests, finally, on all the nations of the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have read the address of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] delivered at Yeshiva University in New York City today.

I think it is a highly creditable presentation of the situation by one of our most distinguished Senators and national leaders.

I wish to emphasize the critical importance of the confrontation which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] seeks between Secretary of State Rusk and the Chinese Foreign Minister, so that within the framework of negotiations for peace in Vietnam the real party in interest, Communist China, may be negotiated with.

I have urged generally the same thing, but this is a most impressive and important presentation. I am very honored, as the Senator from New York, that Senator MANSFIELD has chosen to make this statement before so distinguished a university, which houses one of the most distinguished medical

schools, mathematics schools, and business schools in my State.

I am pleased and I utter these words in appreciation as well as approval.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, a singularly thoughtful speech seeking out the basic causes for war in the Far East was made this morning by Senator MANSFIELD at Yeshiva University.

He points out that the present escalating cause of hostilities in southeast Asia is likely to follow the pattern of Korea, where the escalation continued until there was substantial direct confrontation between American and Chinese troops. Then and only then did both sides find it to their interests to cease escalation. This is an expensive and blood-letting process.

Then, the Senator from Montana also points out that the escalation of our military commitment in South Vietnam has been accompanied, not by a reduction in the commitment of North Vietnamese regular troops, but by a very substantial increase.

Senator MANSFIELD urges that we all probe for an Asian conference seeking to work out some sort of *modus vivendi* in southeast Asia. As he says:

What a conference at this time must be concerned with is, in the first instance, a curb on the expansion of the war and a prompt and durable termination of the tragic bloodletting in Viet Nam.

It must be concerned with insuring a choice free of coercion of any kind to the people of South Viet Nam over their future and on the question of the reunification of Viet Nam.

It must be concerned with how the independence and the territorial integrity, not only of Vietnam, but of other small nations of Southeast Asia can be safeguarded in peace.

It must be concerned, finally, with how foreign bases and foreign military forces can be promptly withdrawn and excluded from Viet Nam and other parts of the Southeast Asian mainland.

I endorse these recommendations very much, and hope that Senator MANSFIELD's excellent speech may be followed by initiative in the direction he has indicated.

AMERICAN COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by the distinguished economist, Dr. Eliot Janeway, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on June 13, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPE SHOULD BAG CRITICISM, BUY COAL
(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, June 12.—"What would you do?" This is the question with which the President springs his technique for disarming critical but unwary visitors, even before they express their choice of weapons or take aim at their pet policy targets. Interwoven with "the treatment" is the standard version of L. B. J.'s "Life and Hard Times," climaxed with the latest chapter about "All the Alternatives Available to Us"—and then, the wily old master magician pops the big question again: "What would you do?" It's easier for visitors to agree with the President than to

stand up to the presence and be counted as a critic with a positive to the disarming questions.

At the treasury by contrast the operation is simpler—and correspondingly less effective. There the tables are turned: It's the visitors who do the asking and the authorities who do the answering. Ever since the dollar payments deficit became troublesome the critical question has been: "Why do we play our dollar hand from weakness?" And the standard response is: "Because the European central bankers think we should."

NOT CHAMPION'S WAY

But no champion with a winner's instinct ever plays according to the rules laid down by the challenger. Whenever a great power with a position of primacy to defend allows itself to be bullied into appeasement of ultimatum from countries seeking a bargaining advantage against it, the balance of power is sure to change—adversely for the country in our present position.

Looking back on what Russia has accomplished for herself since Lenin worried how many days the bolshevik might hang on to power, there's no doubt that the Moscow success story has not followed a script written for the Kremlin by our side. There's no doubt either that Red China's drive to go Russia one better is based on a hard and shrewd calculation of what is good for China—not what will please or placate her foreign critics.

Nor is it as if our European critics had disciplined themselves to practice the good economic housekeeping they preach at us. Take the case of coal. It certainly gets down to basics. It tells a horror story of uneconomic protectionism in Europe, where inflation is feeding on America's inability to sell the one commodity that it is in Europe's interest to buy. If we took less guff from Europe, and she took more coal from us, things would be going better on both sides of the Atlantic; and there would be less inflation on each side.

WEST GERMANY LEADS

West Germany is the most productive country in Europe, and the richest—despite her wasteful coal protectionism. America's "new" economy may now run on the motive power supplied by consumer expenditures on holiday travel, color TV and false hairpieces. But, in West Germany, more than ever, the economy goes as steel goes. And, right now, it's not going nearly as well as all the European lecturing of America for alleged inflationary malpractice suggests.

The specific provocation which brought forth this bombshell is a long-standing political decision which hurts the German steel industry without, however, helping the protected German coal industry: It remains hopelessly uncompetitive, burdened with unmarketable surpluses and tying up labor badly needed elsewhere. Official import restrictions limit the sales of American coal to 5 million tons a year. But unofficial restrictions bar it from crossing into the steel-producing districts, which are stuck with the high-cost, otherwise unsalable native product: Hence the grievance and the threat.

SEVEN TO EIGHT DOLLAR SAVINGS ON COAL

American coal can be laid down alongside German steel mills at savings of \$7-\$8 a ton [after allowing for the cost of ocean freight, which eats up \$2.50 a ton of the savings]. Thus, if Bonn merely doubled her American coal import quota, her steel mills would save some 40 million dollars a year in coal costs, which our coal industry would earn; and West Germany and America together would generate earnings of upwards of 10 million dollars a year for the countries from which we buy shipping and to which we both sell goods.

There may be a working—and a workable—answer here to the President's rhetorical

June 16, 1966

12859

cal question: "What would you do?" Tell Europe's central bankers that our coal can do more to fight inflation in their back yards than their self-serving advice can do to fight it in our front door.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I particularly invite the attention of Senators to the closing two paragraphs in the article, in which Dr. Janeway says:

American coal can be laid down alongside German steel mills at savings of \$7-\$8 a ton.

Less than German coal.

It seems to me that this opens a great opportunity for greater profit for German steel mills and a partial solution to our balance-of-payments problems.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRAISED

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, an informative editorial in the New Orleans Times-Picayune contains a very good explanation of the mission of the Agency for International Development—AID—in Vietnam.

As the article states:

It is nonmilitary (but occasionally dangerous), and complements the war effort by helping the local government and populace achieve a level of broad, capable well-being that will support the current anti-Communist struggle and build a nation able to stand on its own when the war is eventually over and the U.S. protectors withdrawn.

The paper adds:

It is, then, important work that needs and deserves the best talent obtainable.

In the conviction that others will want to read the article, I ask permission to have it inserted in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Mar. 21, 1966]

AID SEEKS AID HERE

It had become rather an irrelevant cliché before the Honolulu conference that the war in Viet Nam would really be won not in the military field but in the fields of politics, economics, and social development. The Honolulu conference, however, put a new emphasis on such programs and the increased United States military commitment has provided them with a sounder shield. A continuing but presently crucial problem of the development campaign is reflected in the current drive by the Agency for International Development (AID) for employees for its Viet Nam operations.

A recruiting team is in town to interview and, it hopes, sign up men and women with both the qualifications and the motivation to do service in Viet Nam. AID now has 800 employees in Viet Nam and needs 500 more (local and contract employees swell the program total to several thousand). Its need has forced it to reassign its own people elsewhere to Viet Nam (service there had previously been voluntary) and to go to the labor market in a special drive.

The aid program in Viet Nam is concerned with "a developing nation, with its public safety, education, agriculture, health services, and economic development," said Assistant Administrator Robert Herder, here to open the New Orleans-based drive. It is non-military (but occasionally dangerous), and complements the war effort by helping the local government and populace achieve a

level of broad, capable well-being that will support the current anti-Communist struggle and build a nation able to stand on its own when the war is eventually over and the U.S. protectors withdrawn. It is, then, important work that needs and deserves the best talent obtainable.

RESPONSIBILITY LACKING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter written by Mary G. Hundley, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, June 14, 1966.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESPONSIBILITY LACKING

SIR: The recent White House Conference on Civil Rights has left many public spirited citizens disillusioned and frustrated. It seems that we have reached a deadlock in our long struggle for the progress and rights of colored Americans. Now that the laws have been passed, we are still confronted with subtle forces of hatred and baffling problems of competition. Demagogues are haranguing the people, dividing Negroes into groups according to color or means, and promoting animosity among them, just as the slaveholders used to do.

Elements of revolt are seriously threatening the social order. Criminals and dropouts are excused as victims of society, but no one has the courage to blame them for refusing to do an honest day's work. Parents uphold children who defy the teacher and, later, they blame the school when the pupils show their ignorance of the 3 Rs. Civic groups with no constructive program to offer attack schools, school boards and school officials who are dedicated public servants.

Civic responsibility used to be encouraged and clean neighborhoods were a source of pride. Today the teacher, the police and the landlord are blamed for the community's problems: everyone else demands freedom for himself and obligations are overlooked.

MARY G. HUNDLEY.

SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, there are times when it is fitting to interrupt our proceedings to recognize the achievements of a great American. It is my pleasure today to do this—to make public the esteem that Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS has engendered in my heart and the hearts of my colleagues in the Senate.

Senator DOUGLAS has distinguished himself in a variety of roles—as a hero in the crucible of war, as a student and professor in the halls of our great universities, and as a pioneer of social legislation in the U.S. Congress. Most Americans would be honored to be as successful in a single field as Senator DOUGLAS has been in many.

On June 3, 1966, Amherst College presented Senator DOUGLAS with an honorary doctor of laws degree, in appreciation of his unselfish devotion to our country. In accepting this degree, Senator DOUGLAS spoke of "the eternal struggle of the human spirit to build a better country and a better world." Who more characterizes this spirit than Senator DOUGLAS himself?

I am sure, Mr. President, that all of us can benefit from the wisdom and experience of our respected colleague. I therefore request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of Senator DOUGLAS' Amherst address, as well as the corresponding citation from the college.

There being no objection, the address and citation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS AT THE AMHERST COLLEGE GRADUATION EXERCISES, AMHERST, MASS., JUNE 3, 1966

I am deeply appreciative of the great honor you have conferred upon me and I want to thank the President, the faculty and the Governing Board for it. I shall always treasure this distinction.

The calendar tells me that it was forty years ago that I had the pleasure of teaching young men in this happy valley. But the senses tell me that it was only yesterday, and that the dignified men in their early sixties whom I apparently see before me are in reality the slim youths who dared me to interest them in their studies—a challenge to which I am afraid I made a very imperfect response.

It was a time of hidden weaknesses and of outer contentment. There was deep and widespread poverty at home, while abroad Russian Communism was consolidating its gains. The Blackshirts had firm control over Italy, while an unsuccessful artist by the name of Adolf Schickelgruber, nursing his emotional wounds in prison, wrote down his gospel of hate in *Mein Kampf*.

But all this made little impression upon prosperous Americans, or upon their sons and daughters who congregated in the halls of academe.

All of us were living in a more or less happy state of euphoria engendered by the continual rise in the stock market which most men believed was making middle and upper class America painlessly rich.

The naturally rebellious instincts of youth turned in the 20's to H. L. Mencken and the *American Mercury* for inspiration, and sought self-realization in the revolt against prohibition and indeed all Victorian taboos. Sigmund Freud became the arbiter of morals and the ultimate evil was thought to be the suppression of desire since this created "complexes" which were thought to prevent integrated personalities. A self-conscious group of writers and artists were strutting on the left bank of the Seine as they somewhat grandiloquently proclaimed themselves "the lost generation."

Those happy and slightly pagan days have long since vanished into the mists of time. They in fact exploded in a day of apocalyptic thunder in the stock market crash of October, 1929. For then a carefree generation learned that life indeed was real and earnest.

Since then, the men of the 20's have seen and taken part in the worst of recorded depressions and the bloodiest war in human history. Many of our number have perished physically, economically or spiritually in these catastrophes. We have seen the infamous racial crimes of the Nazis and the almost equally brutal class and bureaucratic crimes of the Communies. We have seen the rise of a new set of police states as cruel and ruthless as their predecessors. We have seen the Einstein formula of $E=MC^2$ become a terrible reality as the latent energy within the atom has been released and now hangs over the world as a black cloud of threatened universal and mutual destruction.

But we have also seen, and I hope taken part in, the eternal struggle of the human spirit to build a better country and a better world. We have seen the numbers of the poor cut in half and a concerted effort made to further reduce their number and to give

12860

the oncoming boys and girls a better chance to get ahead. We have seen the health of the nation improve, the span of life lengthen and the time spent in school extended. We are seeing an ever growing movement to dissolve the prejudices of race and to make those of darker skins full-fledged citizens of the United States with equal rights and duties.

And now, in this sylvan and quiet setting, we pause for a few brief hours as an island in the midst of time to witness the ever continuing act of human renewal and of a new stream of youth graduating from this college and by doing so entering the wide river of adult life.

It is well that they should do so after four years of comparatively quiet timelessness in which the generations could blend and blur and in which issues could be considered *sub specie aeternitatis* or "under the aspects of eternity."

We know not what will be their fate or indeed our own. Life has many individual and collective perils. But, although probably most of the youngsters graduating here today do not want advice from their elders, possibly a few may, and may inquiringly ask, "What do you think life and history have really taught you? Are there any hints which you can offer us on the conduct of life?" Any reply must of necessity be incomplete and somewhat self-conscious, but perhaps you will pardon me if I attempt to answer what are, I believe, these unspoken hungers of the human heart.

That what is most needed in the world is love—or energized good will—which, if given a chance and practiced with devotion can in most cases melt antagonisms within a democratic society and reconcile opposites.

That truth has at once a compulsive and healing power. We should not be afraid of truth, for if recognized and acted upon, it is the rock upon which we can base our individual and collective lives.

That in its larger aspects, truth is not simple but subtle. Frequently, it requires a long process of discovery both by the probings of research and the sifting induced by dialogue.

That in dealing with the winds of doctrine, in the words of Jefferson, "We should not be afraid to tolerate error as long as reason be left free to combat it."

That when aggression stalks either a community or the world, resistance to it is both necessary and noble, lest it become all pervasive. And it is well that it should be checked in its early days before it can acquire the cumulative momentum of success.

That human courage in defense of an ideal is an ultimate virtue which we should not permit the pressures of conformity to diminish. The nation which minimizes courage is on the road to destruction.

That the Athenians did well to make the owl and the olive tree their symbols to denote wisdom and peace. But freedom tempered with love is the only atmosphere in which true wisdom and peace can flourish. And to preserve and maintain all these virtues, a strong admixture of Spartan courage is needed. Thermopylae was necessary that Socrates might practice his dialectic.

Sometimes these virtues—love, truth, freedom, reason, and courage—are decided as mere semantic abstractions. But they are not that; they are living realities whose power we can increase by practicing them systematically.

Finally, let us not neglect laughter and joy as vital elements in the good life. For let us remember that Beethoven closed his Ninth Symphony with his Hymn to Joy, and that Shakespeare wisely asked in "Twelfth Night," "And dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, that there shall be no more cakes and ale?"

TEXT OF CITATION GIVEN SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS BY AMHERST COLLEGE

"PAUL HOWARD DOUGLAS, United States Senator, Phi Beta Kappa, son of Bowdoin, Master and Doctor of Philosophy from Columbia."

"We are grateful that the kaleidoscope of institutions where you have taught includes Amherst College from 1924 to 1927. As teacher, scholar, Marine, politician and statesman, you have shown that there is a universality to real distinction which cannot be imprisoned in a single specialty or occupation. Your achievement is an inspiration we need always before us, and we are grateful that you can be the example. But you, sir, have received so many honors that one more may seem redundant so today, while we recognize your outstanding service, we are also greeting you with the affection accorded the lost lamb, or a former professor at Amherst."

ALASKA AS A VACATION LAND

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I can, and often do, talk at length about the many attractions which make Alaska a great vacation land. However, I am sure that listeners, limited to those who have not been to Alaska, tend to dismiss my statements as overexaggerated because of excessive pride in my home State.

That may well be, for it is quite easy to take great pride in the awesome beauty and rugged history of the 49th State.

Fortunately my feelings about Alaska as a vacation land are echoed by many tourists who have visited the great Northwest.

One of those tourists, William R. Mathews, devoted an editorial in a recent edition of the Arizona Daily Star, of Tucson, to extolling the virtues of Alaska. His laudatory words carry added weight because he comes from a State which is a great vacation land itself.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mathews' editorial be printed in the RECORD as evidence that we Alaskans know of what we speak when we brag of the attractions of our State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, May 29, 1966]

ALASKA AS A VACATION LAND

(By William R. Mathews)

The coming of summer vacationtime arouses thoughts of where to go and what to see, of doing something interesting. Many of us who live in the arid Southwest like to see something different and some of the young and old like to do a bit of luxurious adventuring without too great a cost.

One of the most delightful and least expensive trips I have ever taken in all of my travels was one to Alaska, which took in also Yukon Territory, including Dawson and the famous Klondike. It can be done easily now by motorcar, as well as by plane, ship and bus, or various combinations of these varied means of transportation.

A trip by motorcar can be made with greatly increased ease, if one uses the new ferry service that runs from a point near Vancouver, north as far as Skagway. The trip is one of the most beautiful and comfortable ones in the world. The ferries provide ample staterooms for the ride, and will

carry your car along. On the way you can see such interesting places as Ketchikan, and the capital city of Juneau and its nearby glaciers.

You can make a trip by air from Seattle, nonstop to Anchorage, in a few hours, which gives one a chance to fly over the gorgeous mountains and their surrounding snow deserts. At times, as far as your eyes can see, there is nothing but snow, with craggy peaks protruding now and then. But the delightful, restful and adventurous way to go is by ferry from Vancouver north as far as Skagway.

Skagway is a nearly deserted port city which served as the jumping-off point for the rush to the Klondike. The new ferry service, which was not going in 1961, must help this city that looks like a large deserted mining camp. It has all kinds of empty stores and houses.

It has a folklore of its own. It is a well-laid-out city, which never has expanded as planned. It is the starting point of the narrow-gauge railroad that climbs through the historic mountain pass across the high Rockies. The railroad ride is comfortable and spectacular. After the train passes into Yukon Territory, it stops at a station where passengers can stuff themselves with deliciously prepared food by helping themselves. The cost is modest. The train continues to White Horse, which is a clean, modern Canadian city.

At this city, one can be surprised by the number of beautiful river steamers that compare to those that used to ply the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. They now are tied up. They are obsolete. Good roads have deprived them of their business.

This trip from Skagway to White Horse can be made easily by motorcar. A motorist can choose to go to White Horse and thence to Dawson and the Klondike, or turn off on the Alcan highway and head for Fairbanks, Alaska. However, the trip to White Horse by train and then to Dawson by a day-long bus ride, passes quickly. The scenery is that interesting.

Dawson is on the Yukon River, and there too, several of those magnificent river steamers are tied up. One was being made into a museum in 1961. The road to Dawson passes through the Klondike area, which today is a great field of ore dumps. Some gold still is being mined.

The city of Dawson is about half deserted, but it is becoming another Tombstone. It, too, has a heritage of the rough, tough life, with plenty of shootings and killings in its heyday. Robert W. Service lived there. His former home is a museum. Dawson has its historic points just like Tombstone.

Daily bus service runs from Dawson across the mountains and north to Fairbanks. The day-long ride goes through famous moose country. From the road one can see at times a few dredging operations that use the summer months to search for gold. One knows he is back in the United States when the unpaved highway hits the paved Alcan highway in Alaska.

Fairbanks is a thriving American city. A few miles north of it we saw a great dredging operation that works night and day. Fairbanks has a delightful summer climate, but in the winter it has the reputation of being one of the coldest cities in the world.

No one should miss flying from Fairbanks 500 miles north over the mountains to Point Barrow, the most northerly point of land of the North American continent. It is essentially a naval oil land base. The waters of the Arctic Ocean lap its shore. It is inhabited mostly by Eskimos.

There I learned for the first time that tides do not prevail in the Arctic Ocean. In the summertime, some remnants of icebergs can be seen. The ocean is frozen over most

old and dear friend, our beloved Speaker of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and the distinguished Assistant Minority Leader in the Senate, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL—they typify the leadership of New England. I know they and the other Members of the Congress will address themselves with diligence and perseverance to the legislation before them and I feel strongly that despite all other troubles, you can count on substantial housing legislation in this Session.

May I just close this good opportunity you have given me to talk with you, by paying my personal tribute to a man we loved dearly in the Congress, and one of your greatest sons—our late President and my good friend, John F. Kennedy. I worked hard for President Kennedy when he was in office and I have often thought how well he typified the best in the qualities of leadership we honor.

He set out these qualities once in a speech to the Massachusetts State Legislature, in early January of 1961. He said,

"Courage, judgment, integrity, dedication—these are the historic qualities of the Bay Colony and the Bay State, the qualities which this state has consistently sent to Beacon Hill here in Boston and to Capitol Hill in Washington."

I echo the sentiments of many throughout the land in telling you we will never forget how well he exemplified for us these qualities—of courage, judgment, integrity and dedication.

Thank you very much for your courtesy and attention. I am pleased to be with you at this conference.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES PASSAGE SEEN: NON-PROFIT HOUSING PLANS AIRED AT BOSTON COLLEGE

(By Robert L. Hassett)

A former U.S. representative predicted at Boston College Tuesday that Congress will approve during this session President Johnson's demonstration cities program—an unprecedented effort to rid entire neighborhoods of slums and blighted areas.

Atty. Albert Rains, former chairman of the House subcommittee on housing, spoke at the end of an all-day conference on non-profit housing at the Chestnut Hill campus.

BU IS COSPONSOR

It was cosponsored by the Bureau of Public Affairs at Boston College and Urban America, Inc.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make grants and provide technical assistance to plan and carry out anti-slum programs.

It would also provide for the expansion and improvement of public facilities and social services considered vital to the health and welfare of persons living in blighted areas.

As many as 70 cities may be involved in the program, estimated to cost \$12 million in planning grants and \$2.3 billion in supplementary grants for demonstration projects.

It was further estimated that the budget expenditure for fiscal 1967 would be \$5,000,000.

"A principal purpose of the demonstration cities bill," Rains said, "is to channel funds and programs so as to create substantial additions to the supply of low and moderate income housing—and to combine physical reconstruction and rehabilitation with effective social programs throughout the rebuilding process."

COULD AID 5,000 HERE

"For the largest qualifying cities such as Boston, as stated in the President's message, a relatively modest program could provide better housing for about 5,000 families now living in substandard dwellings."

"It could rehabilitate other marginal housing for perhaps 50,000 more people. And

a typical program could well involve a total of 35,000 units or up to 100,000 people."

Rains told the conference he believes that nonprofit sponsors of housing will be "at the heart of the program."

"Indeed," he said, "the Congress and the President are placing an increasing reliance upon your abilities, your perseverance, your capacity to serve these needs of the nation."

One of the conference speakers was critical of references to housing developments as "projects."

Edward Sullivan, president of Building Service Employees International Union Local 254, said, "I never assumed that when we went into building housing developments, we were going into the project business."

HORSES LIVE BETTER

His union sponsored Academy Homes in Washington Park.

"They talk of disadvantaged people," said Sullivan. "Well, in Roxbury that's a euphemism for Negroes. In Roxbury some Negroes are being housed in conditions worse than the stables at Suffolk Downs."

"The people in Boston don't want all these social services you've been giving them. They don't want visiting nurses or visiting psychiatrists."

"Build them a house and they'll motivate themselves. All these people need is to be treated like everyone else."

The Rev. Henry Browne, president of Stryker's Bay Neighborhood Council in New York City, was also critical of some social service agencies.

"The welfare industry has been living off the poor for years," he said.

James Feeley, chief underwriter of the Federal Housing Administration, told the conference some of today's housing planning is "highly unrealistic."

An example, he said, is the designing of a high-rise apartment house for the accommodation of families with small children, with mothers worried about them playing 10 stories below.

BEFOGGED VISION

"Are we looking at housing through our eyes or through the eyes of those we mean to cater to? When you become so befogged that you impose your will on other people, then you are not serving the public good," Feeley said.

Atty. John R. Gallagher, 3rd, a former FHA counsel, warned the conference that there is not enough non-profit participation in the non-profit housing program.

"This program was established to take care of those people who earn too much to make them eligible for public housing but not enough to be able to meet high rentals," Gallagher said.

"Unless more non-profit people get into the program, the federal government will and maybe we will not like that very much."

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRAMS IN THE HAMLETS AND VILLAGES OF SOUTH VIETNAM ARE MAKING PERCEPTIBLE PROGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following interesting report with respect to the conflict in Vietnam:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 8, 1966]

BEHIND THE WAR

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The latest intelligence from the U.S. Embassy in Saigon shows that finally, after years of rosy propaganda but half-hearted efforts,

social and economic programs in the hamlets and villages of South Vietnam are making perceptible progress.

Between 1962 and 1965, for example, 7 million textbooks for schoolchildren were distributed throughout South Vietnam. For this year alone, the goal of 6 million additional textbooks is on schedule. New classrooms and teachers are growing at roughly equal proportions.

The commodity import program for rice, sugar, cement, condensed milk and other priority items for the reconstruction program is now moving about twice as fast as a year ago. In August, 1965, 107,000 tons of non-military imports were unloaded from ships that often had to wait in Saigon's rivers for more than a month before unloading. The monthly rate of imports today is 200,000 tons and the unloading time has been sharply cut.

These statistics reflect the change in attitudes and priorities since President Johnson elevated the reconstruction program, always an impoverished stepchild of the war, to a position roughly equal to the military effort.

The President gave Deputy Ambassador William Porter full responsibility in Saigon to break bottlenecks and require the military to cooperate on civilian programs. In Washington, he made White House aide Robert Komer a virtual czar over reconstruction, bringing into one office control over the entire program.

What this means is that Komer can get immediate action from Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara (who is as fully committed to reconstruction as the President himself) whenever command decisions are needed to free supplies for the reconstruction program.

Before Komer in Washington and Porter in Saigon were established as President Johnson's personal agents empowered to command, the nonmilitary program was condemned to second-class status.

Since the Honolulu Conference last winter, when the President ordered an all-out reconstruction offensive, other changes have occurred that just might end years of misleading eyewash flowing from Saigon.

Reports coming into Saigon from the village, district and provincial level always tended to exaggerate progress in reconstruction. In turn, these reports were inevitably further exaggerated when the U.S. Mission in Saigon sent them on to Washington. The result was a pyramiding of rosy facts and figures completely beyond reality.

Now a serious effort has been made to change all that. Specific orders have gone to Saigon that the monthly reports from the field are to be transmitted to Washington without the change of a comma. And U.S. reconstruction experts in the field have been warned not to overplay the impact of the program in their areas.

Furthermore, the first class of 4500 specially-trained Vietnamese reconstruction experts—the Black Pajama cadres—was graduated from the new school at Vungtau on May 21. This first contingent was divided into groups or cadres of about 50 specialists each, including a small "census survey" team in each cadre, and assigned to villages and hamlets.

The census survey teams are the first important effort by the Saigon government to discover in a systematic way how the peasants really feel about the Communist Vietcong. Under the cover of taking a census, these survey teams ask innocuous-sounding questions which hopefully will give the government its first look at the political motivation of the peasants.

For years, Washington has been celebrating the peaceful reconstruction program in South Vietnam. For years, nothing much has been accomplished. If this time it is different, the major reasons is that at long last healthy realism is nudging aside the old euphoria.

June 16, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12833

Well, I don't like to make predictions, but I really doubt that the Housing Subcommittee will write a blank check on authority for appropriations; nor do I think they are likely to place the full burden of decision as to the scope of the program upon the Appropriations Committees. It seems warranted to me that the Congress should define the program to some degree, and indeed this may be necessary to obtain its passage.

Certainly the funds for planning grants should be authorized to get the program started. And how far beyond this is absolutely necessary at this point remains to be seen. The Mayors of New York and Detroit, in very able presentations, pointed to the insufficiency of total funds even at the maximum level authorizations recommended by the Administration. It was further suggested that the total obligational authority be made available for contracts at the earliest possible time.

Perhaps the answer lies in between the conflicting demands, as so often is the case. It would very likely be a mistake to authorize planning grants without some level of authority for contractual supplementary grants. Therefore I think a reasonable solution might be found in the approval of such authority for the supplementary grants as is estimated to be required for expenditures during the fiscal years immediately ahead. The President's Message on Housing mentioned a level of \$400 million per year. This will get the program started and at the same time, give the Congress and the cities the opportunity to understand more clearly its boundaries and its opportunities.

Already there are detailed and specific guidelines in the legislation on qualification of cities. Other criteria have been suggested during the hearings. Secretary Weaver has warned that it will not be easy to qualify for assistance. Mayor Lindsay and Ed Logue have argued that it should be made easy to qualify and as easy as possible.

My tendency would be to urge simplicity. The legislative history and the bill as introduced already set forth the many considerations to be encompassed in a decision on qualification. I would hope the procedure would be simple, quick and as inexpensive as possible. The concepts of project magnitude, city-wide balance, local resources, adequate administrative machinery, etc., are all capable of demonstration without lengthy bureaucratic dickerings.

On this point, I might add, the idea of a federal coordinator as a mandatory part of the program could be a help or a hindrance, depending on the circumstances and the city. I think such an appointment might be made a discretionary matter with the Secretary—and the post might be easier if he were labeled something different. A "demonstration coordinator" sounds a lot less like a czar than a "federal coordinator".

You may wonder, in all of this, where the nonprofit group fits in. I hasten to say that your role can be of great significance.

For example, the mayor of Detroit has already placed reliance upon a newly formed nonprofit corporation, made up of leading citizens, to mobilize all the resources of the community. The Detroit nonprofit organization is designed to create massive support in the private community, not only to make the demonstration city program a reality, but also to make the whole redevelopment of their city a practical reality.

About one hundred leaders, civic, business, labor, university heads and others were called together in Detroit and they agreed unanimously that it was necessary to qualify Detroit as a demonstration city. The intention is to stimulate the private sector of the community and to spur greater private investment. In short, if the Federal Government and local government is about to spend several millions of dollars in a demonstration city area, then the private sector of

the economy—through a nonprofit development corporation—should do likewise, and probably can do even a greater job.

This Detroit action resembles the newly formed Cambridge Corporation, which I have heard about. And I am sure that in Boston proper, you have equal resources for citizen and community leadership.

May I point out also that a principle purpose of the Demonstration Cities Bill is to channel funds and programs so as to create substantial additions to the supply of low and moderate income housing—and to combine physical reconstruction and rehabilitation with effective social programs throughout the rebuilding process.

For the largest qualifying cities such as Boston, as stated in the President's Message, a relatively modest program could provide better housing for about 5,000 families now living in substandard dwellings. It could rehabilitate other marginal housing for perhaps 50,000 more people. And a typical program could well involve a total of 35,000 units or up to 100,000 people.

And do you doubt that nonprofit sponsors will be at the heart of this program? I do not. Indeed, the Congress and the President are placing an increasing reliance upon your abilities, your perseverance, your capacity to serve these needs of the Nation.

I think the very fact that The Ford Foundation has made a substantial grant to Urban America, to supply technical assistance to nonprofit groups, is further evidence of the significance of your role. I hope that the great nonprofit organizations of America will join government at all levels in this effort. We need them.

We need the foundations, the universities, the national religious organizations, the great fraternal and civic groups, and the business associations. And when I say "we"—I mean the Congress, the Administration, the cities throughout the land—and, most of all, the people of America.

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING FINANCE

I mentioned earlier that there are a number of other bills before the Committees. Some of them will bear upon your future and your organizations. But I do not propose to discuss them in detail, nor does time permit.

There is now pending, for example, the Administration's bill, H.R. 12946, called the "Urban Development Act". In essence it would provide a new program of grants to stimulate more effective metropolitan planning and development. The first-year program level would be for \$25 million and a five year program is contemplated.

These grants would provide supplemental and increased Federal aid to projects generally affecting the growth of metropolitan areas—for transportation facilities (including mass transit, roads and airports), water and sewer facilities, and recreation and open space areas. Supplementary grants could not exceed 20 percent of the cost of such projects.

I should note that this bill, H.R. 12946, also contains proposed new authority for an expanded 701 program to develop new techniques of metropolitan planning and development. It also proposes, again, the enactment of an expanded FHA insurance program for land development—for "new communities". This would also involve Federal loans made to land development agencies, including cities and other public agencies, to finance the acquisition and planning of large-scale tracts for later development.

A third bill before the Congress, H.R. 13064, would amend and extend the existing laws relating to housing and urban development. As you might expect this is called the "Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966".

Some of these amendments will assist and

liberalize the FHA programs; others will help relocation housing. Two amendments will permit longer leases by local housing authorities and authorize the leasing for housing to be constructed as well as for existing housing. A new program would be authorized to demonstrate methods of applying and encouraging acceptance of technological advances in housing.

HISTORICAL PRESERVATION

I am pleased also to tell you that during the past year I was able to take part in developing legislation of unique interest here in Massachusetts and New England. I had the honor to serve as Chairman of a Special Committee on Historic Preservation, operating under a grant from The Ford Foundation and sponsored by the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Senator MUSKIE of Maine was a member of this Committee and he had Congressman WIDNALL of New Jersey have introduced legislation to carry out our findings. I am hopeful it will pass in this Session. Very briefly our bill would:

1. Create a National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation;
2. Provide for new programs of loans and grants for the acquisition and restoration of structures of historical significance;
3. Permit cities to acquire structures of historic significance for which they would receive credit as local non-cash contributions under the urban renewal program;
4. Set up a three-year program of fellowships for architects and technicians to meet the critical shortage of trained personnel in these fields;
5. Provide urban planning grants for surveys of historical structures; and
6. Make grants to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States for restoration of structures under its administration.

We also hope that legislation will be passed to establish a National Register of sites, buildings, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture. We hope grants can be made to State and local governments for surveys, plans and projects of historical preservation, and to the National Trust for education, service and financial assistance to preservation projects.

THE TEMPER OF CONGRESS

All of the legislation I have described, and much more in housing that defies a detailed summary, must be handled by a Congress beset with the same troubled mood that now permeates the land. Thomas Paine spoke well, back in the Revolutionary Years, when he said "These are the times that try men's souls."

But my recital of what is before the Congress and the country in terms of housing and urban development is most certainly one which rings with hope for the future, which spells growth for the Nation.

Years ago a noted Boston lawyer and reformer, Wendell Phillips, in a moment of exasperation said he believed that, "We live under a government of men and morning newspapers". Sometimes I think this is true. And I have noted recently a few editorials and stories to the effect that we will have no housing bill this year.

It is true that the country and the Congress is concerned with the war in Viet Nam and our difficult situation in other foreign lands. This is true equally in Alabama as in Massachusetts. But too often people forget another saying of Thomas Paine which bites hard at this matter: "The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot," he said, "in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country." Neither the citizenry nor the leadership in either State is apt to fit Paine's classifications.

I know well the leaders of Congress who come from this great Commonwealth—my